



Policy Roundtable for Child Care
Wednesday, October 13, 2010
10:00 a.m. – Noon
Conference Room 743
Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles



Proposed Meeting Agenda

- | | | | |
|-------|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 10:00 | 1. | Welcome and Introductions | Terri Chew Nishimura
Chair |
| | a. | Comments from the Chair | |
| | b. | Review of September 8, 2010 Minutes | Action Item |
| 10:15 | 2. | Updating the Policy Framework for Child Care | Jacquelyn McCroskey |
| | | • Discussion | |
| 10:50 | 3. | Policy Framework Objective: Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes | |
| | | • State Budget Update | Action Item Adam Sonenshein |
| | | • Recommendations for the County Legislative Platform | |
| 11:20 | 4. | Updates | |
| | a. | STEP | Helen Chavez |
| | b. | Statewide Planning Efforts | Sarah Younglove |
| | | • California State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (ELAC) | |
| | | • California Early Learning Quality Improvement System Advisory Committee Report (CAEL QIS) | |
| | c. | Bridge Funding for CDE Funded Programs | Laura Escobedo |
| | d. | First 5 LA | Duane Dennis |
| | e. | Planning for Educare | Whit Hayslip
Ruth Yoon |
| 11:50 | 5. | Announcements and Public Comment | Members & Guests |
| 12:00 | 6. | Call to Adjourn | |

Mission Statement

The mission of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care is to serve as the official County body on all matters relating to child care, working in collaboration with the Child Care Planning Committee and the Children's Planning Council, to build and strengthen the child care system and infrastructure in the County by providing policy recommendations to the Board.



Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • www.childcare.lacounty.gov

MEETING MINUTES

September 8, 2010

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 743

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street

Los Angeles, California

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

a. Comments from the Chair

Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura, Chair of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable), opened the meeting at 10:15 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

• Statement on Bridge Funding

Ms. Nishimura referred to the meeting packets for a copy of the revised document, *An Issue Brief: State Budget Delays and the Need for Temporary Loans for Child Development Services*. At the July retreat, members represented concerns from child development programs regarding the budget stalemate, which is holding up funding for the ongoing delivery of services. Ms. Nishimura relayed that not much progress has been made, raising the question of how can Los Angeles County address the issue of “bridge loans” for programs. Ms. Laura Escobedo has done some research on both local needs and how other counties are responding, which are outlined in the document.

Since the July meeting, the situation is becoming more serious for programs, including the Office of Child Care. The Office of Child has received all three California Department of Education (CDE) contracts (Local Planning Council/Child Care Planning Committee, Investing in Early Educators Program/AB 212, and Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL)) at the same funding levels as last year. Two of the contracts have been accepted by the Board of Supervisors; the third is slated for the September 20, 2010. The LACEL contract has been returned and is fully executed with a small stamp in the lower right hand corner stating “Approved upon enactment of Budget Act.”

The ensuing discussion focused on the distribution of the bridge fund document and next steps. It was noted that First 5 LA has not been formally approached, yet it was determined that the messages outlined in the document need to reach the First 5 Commission, particularly given the Commission meeting agenda for Thursday, September 9, 2010. On the agenda is an action item, ‘Funding Request from the Los Angeles County Board of Education (LACOE) for the

California State Preschool Programs (CSPP)' introduced by Supervisor Gloria Molina. Members and guests urged immediate messages reach the First 5 LA Commission that relay the implications of the delayed State Budget implications on subsidized child care and development programs serving low-income families across the county, including those administered by private, non-profit organizations and family child care homes as well as school districts including LACOE.

Among the suggested approaches to sending messages to the First 5 Commission:

- Use the Roundtable representative, Mr. Duane Dennis, to raise the consequences of a delayed State Budget on the diverse child care and development system in Los Angeles County and the need for bridge loans to help programs maintain services; ask for either a delay in taking action or an opportunity to continue the discussions on behalf of other programs.
- Employ the Board of Supervisor- appointed Roundtable members to contact the Deputies with recommended formal requests to take to the First 5 LA Commission.
- Recruit representatives of impacted child care and development programs to contact their Supervisor's offices directly with personal stories.
- Coordinate a meeting with Ms. Evelyn Martinez to include a representative from the Office of Child Care and the Board-appointed Roundtable members.

Based on the discussion, Ms. Escobedo agreed to prepare talking points, while Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu will arrange for a conference call with Supervisor Molina's office to include Ms. Esther Torrez, Supervisor Molina's appointee to the Roundtable. Ms. Malaske-Samu will send the bridge funding document to Supervisor Molina's office by the afternoon. In addition, Ms. Malaske-Samu will alert Mr. Nicholas Ippolito to the issues raised during the meeting and make sure that all of the Board offices receive a copy of the bridge funding document.

In closing this discussion, a few final thoughts were offered by members and guests. It was noted that there is concern for assuming liability if child development is eliminated from the State budget. A loan assumes that the lender is paid back once funding is secured; if programs are eliminated, there will be no payments on the loan. It was suggested that this needs to be addressed in the messaging, however nuanced.

There is growing interest and urgency to address the impact of ongoing State budget delays in the future. The Los Angeles Preschool Advocacy Initiative (LAPAI) plans to develop strategies for preserving the child development infrastructures during constrained budget negotiations in future years. The LAPAI hopes to have something in place by next year. In the meantime, the Office of Child Care will continue to collect information on loss of programs and

services for children and families, including capturing data on the impact to small businesses (i.e. centers and family child care homes) and jobs.

b. Review of Retreat Minutes

- **July 14, 2010**

Ms. Connie Russell made a motion to approve the minutes; Ms. Esther Torrez seconded the motion. The minutes were approved on a unanimous vote.

- **Accounting Report from Retreat**

Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu reported that members' donations to print the "STEP ribbons" exceeded the cost by \$85, which was put toward the retreat lunch costs. Members and guests were then asked to contribute to the cost of lunch, which was prepared by Ms. Ann Franzen. Cost of lunch and speaker gifts totaled \$224.46, leaving a balance of \$145 as Ms. Franzen would only accept the actual cost of the food. The remaining balance will be saved for future Roundtable expenses.

c. Update on the Steps to Excellence Project (STEP)

Ms. Malaske-Samu provided the following updates:

- The Board of Supervisors accepted the First 5 LA contract on August 31, 2010. The Board letter also authorized STEP to use up to \$38,000 from the Forfeited Dependent Care Spending Account (DCSA) to engage an outside evaluator for a project evaluation. Next steps will be putting together requirements and a request for proposal. The Research Advisory Committee will be convened to assist in preparing the evaluator requirements and evaluation questions.
- During July and August, Nakatomi and Associates completed nine parent focus groups including two conducted in Spanish. The purpose of the focus groups was to gather parent input on the STEP rating guide for parents. The parents offered lots of feedback, which is being used to modify the rating guide.
- The Office of Child Care ran into a funding issue with the STEP Training Consultant. She was forced to take off the last three and a half weeks of August. A new agreement has been established and the Service Integration Branch (SIB) is covering this cost until the CDE contract arrives. If no level of certainty in funding arrives by mid- October, the Office of Child Care may need to terminate her services.
- Ms. Helen Chavez is working on the yearend report. The report will be sent to Roundtable members by e-mail and shared with the California Early Learning Quality Improvement System (CAEL QIS) Advisory Committee and the California State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (ELAC).

2. EDUCARE COMES TO LOS ANGELES

Ms. Nishimura introduced the next agenda item with a great deal of enthusiasm. She read the following taken from the Educare material, “Too often, children from poor families arrive at kindergarten already behind. What’s worse, too many stay behind – and never catch up. Educare is a new way of doing business when it comes to preparing very young children who are growing up in low-income families for success in school and life.” She turned to Mr. Whit Hayslip to talk about Los Angeles Unified School District’s (LAUSD) adventure with Educare.

Mr. Whit Hayslip distributed a handout describing Educare and suggested that a question mark should follow the agenda item title. He mentioned that Educare made its first big splash at the Water Cooler Conference, which was LAUSD’s introduction to the program as well. For background, the Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation (Buffett Foundation) developed an interest in early childhood and began working with folks to address the quality of child development and what was needed to convince legislators and the general public to the value of quality. To that end, the Buffett Foundation undertook creating a high quality child development facility as a leverage project so that people, including legislators and those that operate and work in child development programs, can actually witness a truly high quality child development program with integrated resources for the children and families it serves. The first center was established in Chicago in partnership with Ounce of Prevention, an organization that identified the same gap in the availability of high quality services for those families most in need. Both entities came together to create The Bounce Learning Network with the goal of establishing Educare Centers across the country.

Referring to the handout, Mr. Hayslip relayed that programs are operating in 10 cities across the nation with others underway or in the concept stage. Each center is truly a community collaboration with multiple partners. School districts often provide land, although they are not necessarily the program operators. There is a joint governance system that is complicated, yet clearly spelled out.

Again, LAUSD’s interest was spurred at the Water Cooler Conference, and grew upon visiting an Educare Center. Mr. Hayslip added that as First 5 CA has been planning for the future, it is looking at where to spend its money to impact change more globally. Among its priorities is early childhood education. Working with the David and Packard Foundation (Packard Foundation) and WestEd, efforts have been underway to explore locations for Educare Centers in California based on needs. The Local Planning Councils and the Advancement Project have provided valuable resources in identifying high need areas with large gaps in child development and other services. In Los Angeles County, Bell-Cudahy has been identified as an area with great need – lots of eligible families and a scarcity of services.

In California, conversations among WestEd, the Packard Foundation and the Buffett Foundation have been underway to explore establishing Educare Centers in three identified communities: San Diego, northern California, and Bell-Cudahy in Los Angeles County. The lead in each community has been invited to submit planning proposals and must, as part of its process, identify “core partners” and “strategic partners”. In Los Angeles, the “core partners” include: LAUSD, the Office of Child Care, Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), LACOE-Head Start, Baldwin Park Unified School District Early Head Start, and First 5 LA. “Strategic partners” are the

Alliance for Better Communities (ABC), Families In Schools, LAPAI, the California Community Foundation, East Los Angeles College (ELAC), California State University Los Angeles (CSULA), Unite LA, and University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities. Mr. Hayslip emphasized that Educare is a long-term commitment among the many partners, secured with signed contractual agreements.

A proposal for planning to be funded jointly by the Packard and Buffett Foundations has been submitted and last week was the conference call to discuss the next step in the process – visioning location, governance and philanthropy. While exciting, there is an understanding that funding is inadequate. To address this, among the strategies is maximizing funding by braiding the existing sources of funds. Mr. Hayslip acknowledged that child development programs have not done a good job of braiding in the past, however the plan is to look at the gap and figure out how to bridge it through a braiding of funds and seek the help from the philanthropic partners on bridging the gap. He added that the partners are excited and on board, willing to look at new ways of doing business.

As an aside, the Educare Center would serve between 150 to 200 children from birth to five years old at a cost per child of \$20,000 to \$22,000. The program would operate full-day, full-year.

Mr. Hayslip added that shared governance is new territory for LAUSD; however they are now in a position to take this on. As first steps, LAUSD will need a grant writer and some conveners to help, stating that as a joint community project, this is very important. Already, the Office of Child Care has been asked to help with convening. The Chamber of Commerce and Unite LA also are interested in helping with convening. In addition, partners will be encouraged to travel to Chicago and Omaha for two days to visit existing Educare Centers.

Mr. Hayslip responded to a number of questions and comments and provided further highlights of the program. He mentioned that a professional development center is associated with an Educare center, providing training rooms and hands on experiences. Both ELAC and CSULA are fully on board and foresee using the Center as their lab schools. ABC plans to establish an early care and education task force in southeast Los Angeles, which could help mobilize the community around an Educare. Ms. Terry Ogawa encouraged using the Office of Child Care as a convener with the ability to bring representatives of County Departments and community stakeholders with their resources to the table.

Mr. Hayslip emphasized that Educare is a different way of doing things in a way that is responsive to the community and their needs. The community is a critical partner. Parent engagement is strongly encouraged. One area that an Educare in Los Angeles can contribute to the larger network is by becoming a model for dual language learners.

Ms. Malaske-Samu gave kudos to Mr. Hayslip, stating that Educare is an incredible opportunity that is benefiting from contributions of several groups in the community.

3. UPDATE ON CALIFORNIA'S EARLY LEARNING EFFORTS

Dr. Celia Ayala announced that she is resigning from the Roundtable as she takes on her new duties as LAUP's Chief Executive Office. Mr. Adam Sonenshein is in the process of becoming LAUP's representative.

a. California State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care (ELAC) and California Early Learning Quality Improvement System (CAEL QIS) Advisory Committee

Dr. Celia Ayala began her update by noting the alignment between the work of the ELAC Advisory Council and Educare. She recognized the contributions of community stakeholders to the planning process for designing an early childhood quality improvement system and foresees an early care and education system in 20 years that looks very different than the current system.

Dr. Ayala spoke to the transition of the CAEL QIS Advisory Committee into the ELAC Advisory Council, which will be complete once the CAEL QIS report is submitted to the legislature in December. A copy of the meeting schedule for both groups was distributed to members and guests. She iterated that meetings are open to the public.

According to Dr. Ayala, the big issues still under discussion are:

- Design – teacher qualifications, professional development, facility design
- Workforce – compensation, degree requirements (level and field of study), career pathways, family child care home participation
- Funding – braiding funding and more
- Role of community partners – Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Local Planning Councils, higher education, and more
- Parent engagement

Dr. Ayala suggested that one of the biggest issues will be obtaining buy-in from various stakeholders and addressing incentives for parents, programs and providers to participate. She added that to change the current system, legislation and funding are required. Dr. Ayala reminded members and guests that all of this work is not just about the early care and education system, it is also about supporting work and contributing to the local economy.

Ms. Escobedo, adding to Dr. Ayala's report, relayed that testing of the system has been discussed at great length. Some agreements were reached about what to include in a Request for Proposal (RFP) to have groups test the system in certain locales. Dr. Ayala stated that ELAC funding will be used to pilot further models emerging across the state, such as STEP (quality rating system), LAUP (tiered reimbursement), San Diego (Power of Preschool), Fresno, Tuolumne, and San Francisco.

4. POLICY FRAMEWORK OBJECTIVE

Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes.

a. State Budget Update

Mr. Adam Sonenshein reported that a State Budget is expected some day; however progress toward an agreement is slow. Last week, the Legislature tested votes on the two competing budget bills; neither met the two-third threshold in either house. As of September 9th, the Governor will be out of town. There are worries that the work will be passed on to the new Governor. In the meantime, it is recommended that the Roundtable forward to the Board of Supervisors a request for a pursuit of position communicating the critical importance of resolving the Budget crisis and arriving at a budget which preserves services for children and families.

Discussion focused on the expected outcome of taking an action as the Board of Supervisors is on record opposing the elimination of programs. In addition, the child care and development community and the parents they serve have been mobilized by the Child Care Resource and Referral (R&Rs) Agencies to send letters to legislators. Ms. Escobedo replied that the Child Care Planning Committee is eager to go on record relaying the need for a budget, however depends on the Roundtable's process to make policy recommendations to the Board. It was suggested that a well-crafted letter could inform legislators to the harm being done to children and families unable to access or continue their child development service, the potential of the proposals to undermine the child development system, and the ability to recover the longer budget negotiations are delayed.

Ms. Malaske-Samu made a motion to 1) check with the Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs Branch on the process for pursuing a position on the budget that urges resolution to a responsible budget and preserves services to children and families; 2) recommend a pursuit of position to the Board of Supervisors; and 3) prepare a letter to legislators stressing the negative impact the delayed budget is having on child care and development programs and other services for children and families and urge support for preserving programs. Mr. Dennis seconded the motion.

b. Los Angeles County Legislative Agenda - 2011-12

Mr. Sonenshein referred members and guests to their meeting packets for copies of the following materials: *Recommendations for County of Los Angeles State Legislative Agenda for A2011-12 - Child Care And Development, Recommendations for County of Los Angeles Federal Agenda for the 112th Congress – Children and Family Services, and Public Policy Platform – FY 2011-12.* Beginning with the proposals for the County's State Legislative Agenda for Child Care and Development, Mr. Sonenshein reviewed the highlighted, modest changes to the child care and development items intended to provide clarity. He then directed the members to the remaining sections of the proposed agenda items, stating that the Joint Committee on Legislation reviewed the sections prepared by other County departments that directly serve children and families who could potentially benefit from being connected to high quality child care and development programs. The proposed revisions to listed items and the addition of new items are consistent with implementation of the Policy Framework.

Ms. Arlene Rhine made a motion to forward the recommended changes to the County's State Legislative Agenda for 2011-12 to the Board of Supervisors; Dr. Ayala seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Next, Mr. Sonenshein presented the recommended revisions to the County's federal legislative agenda for the 112th Congress. Mr. Sonenshein noted that the federal legislative items are much more broadly stated and categorized than the state items in that there is no separate section for child care and development.

Ms. Ayala made a motion to forward the recommended changes to the County's Federal Legislative Agenda for the 112th Congress to the Board of Supervisors; Ms. Torrez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Lastly, Mr. Sonenshein referred members to the matrix of legislation. AB 2592 (Buchanan), which would have placed into State statute the implementation of a quality rating scale, died. On the other hand, SB 1381 (Simitian), which would change the required birthday for kindergarten entry, is pending the Governor's signature.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

None

6. CALL TO ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

Commissioners Present:

Dr. Celia Ayala	Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu
Mr. Duane Dennis	Ms. Carolyn Naylor
Ms. Ann Franzen	Ms. Terri Chew Nishimura
Mr. Michael Gray	Ms. Arlene Rhine
Mr. Whit Hayslip	Ms. Connie Russell
Ms. Charlotte Lee	Ms. Esther Torrez

Guests:

Ms. Ellen Cervantes, Child Care Resource Center
Ms. Leticia Colchado, Dept. of Public Social Services (DPSS)
Ms. Jennifer Cowan, First 5 LA
Ms. Liz Diaz, City of L.A. Community Development
Ms. Leila Espinoza, UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families & Communities
Mr. Sam Kirk, Child Care Planning Committee
Ms. Terry Ogawa, Education Coordinating Council
Ms. Dianne Philibosian, California State University Northridge
Ms. Kate Sachnoff, First 5 LA
Ms. JoAnn Shalhoub-Mejia, CA Federation of Family Child Care Associations
Mr. Adam Sonenshein, Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP)

Staff:

Ms. Laura Escobedo
Ms. Michelle Sartell



County of Los Angeles Policy Roundtable for Child Care



Policy Brief

October 14, 2010 (Draft)

GOVERNOR SIGNS 2010-11 BUDGET BILLS: IMPACT ON CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Overview

Governor Schwarzenegger signed the 2010-11 State Budget bill and xx implementation bills on October 8, 2010. In signing the budget, the Governor exercised his line item veto authority to achieve his goal of closing the \$19.3 billion budget gap, increasing the reserve from \$375 million to \$1.3 billion and pushing a comprehensive plan for pension reform.¹ The Budget, a combination of reductions, federal funds and other solutions, keeps spending at \$86.6 billion for 2010-11, compared to \$86.3 billion for 2009-10.

Child Care and Development Services

The Budget Act of 2010 (Senate Bill 870, Chapter 712) contains substantial cuts to child care and development programs. Table 1 summarizes the revisions to child care and development services administered under the California Department of Education (CDE), Child Development Division and Learning Supports.

Table A. Fiscal Impact of Budget Act of 2010 - Child Care and Development Services			
Program	2009-10 ²	2010-11 ³	Change
Child Development Division			
State Preschool	\$373,378,000	\$379,518,000	\$6,140,000
General Child Development	\$779,849,000	\$758,374,000	-\$21,475,000
Migrant Child Care	\$36,246,000	\$30,579,000	-\$5,667,000
Alternative Payment Program	\$258,811,000	\$251,770,000	-\$7,041,000
CalWORKs Stage 2 (AP) ⁴	\$439,620,000	\$193,650,000	-\$245,970,000
CalWORKs Stage 3 (AP)	\$393,373,000	\$109,918,000	-\$283,455,000
Resource and Referral Programs	\$19,438,000	\$18,688,000	-\$750,000
Extended Day/Latchkey ⁵	\$5,000,000		-\$5,000,000
Handicap Allowance	\$2,011,000	\$1,940,000	-\$71,000
California Child Care Initiative	\$250,000	\$250,000	
Quality Improvement	\$49,247,000	\$47,115,000	-\$2,132,000
Centralized Eligibility List	\$7,900,000	\$7,900,000	
Local Planning Councils ⁶	\$6,637,000	\$3,319,000	-\$3,318,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$2,371,760,000</i>	<i>\$1,803,021,000</i>	<i>-\$568,739,000</i>
Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)	0	0	
Growth	0	0	
<i>Subtotal COLA and Growth</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>0</i>	
<i>Child Care Facilities Revolving Fund</i>	<i>\$5,000,000</i>	<i>\$5,000,000</i>	
Child Care and Development Services Total			
Learning Supports			
After School Education and Safety Program	\$546,898,000		
21 st Century Community Learning Centers	\$169,371,000	\$174,034,000	
Cal-SAFE Child Care	\$24,778,000	\$24,778,000	
Pregnant Minor Programs ⁷	\$13,327,000	\$13,327,000	
<i>Learning Supports Total</i>	<i>To be completed</i>		
Child Care and Development and Learning Supports Grand Total			

- Quality Improvements

Table 2 summarizes the Budget appropriations reserved to improve the quality and availability of child care and development services.⁸

Table 2. Quality Improvement Detail			
Program	2009-10⁹	2010-11¹⁰	Change
Schoolage Care and Resource and Referral	\$1,930,629	\$2,002,671	\$72,042
Infant and Toddler Earmark	\$10,873,244	\$11,342,626	\$469,382
Quality expenditures to be defined ¹¹	\$2,969,000	\$664,000	-\$2,305,000
CalWORKs Careers in Child Development	\$4,000,000	\$3,591,000	-\$409,000
Training for license-exempt providers	\$2,500,000	\$1,250,000	-\$1,250,000
DSS contract for licensing inspections ¹²	\$8,000,000	\$12,300,000	Federal funds
Trustline Registration Workload	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
Health and Safety Training	\$500,000	\$500,000	
Health Hotline ¹³	\$300,000	\$231,000	Until 10/1/10
Preschool Education Projects ¹⁴		\$114,000	Until 10/1/10
Child Dev Permit Matrix Prof Growth Advisors		\$63,000	Until 10/1/10
Child Care Recruitment and Retention Programs	\$15,000,000	\$11,825,000	-\$3,175,000
Child Development Training Consortium	\$320,000	\$320,000	
Total Quality Improvement Budget	\$47,392,873	\$45,203,297	

CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care

The Governor reduced \$256,000,000 in State General Funds from CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care “to help bring ongoing expenditures in line with existing resources and to build a prudent reserve”. The remaining balance of \$128,823,000 in federal funds will support the program through October 2010, when the services are terminated.^{15 16}

According to the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles, 17,100 children ages birth through 12 years old of 11,700 families in Los Angeles county will lose their child care services as of November 1, 2010 due to the elimination of CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care. The estimated 6,000 providers – largely licensed centers and family child care homes - serving these families are at risk of reducing or closing their operations. Ramifications will also ripple through the organizations that administer the funds - Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies and Alternative Payment Programs – resulting in 400 layoffs.¹⁷

Regional Market Rate (RMR) Reduction for License-exempt Providers

The Budget reduces the reimbursement rate for license-exempt providers from 90 to 80 percent of the rates paid to licensed family child care providers. Effects voucher-based programs inclusive of Alternative Payment and CalWORKs Stage 1 and 2 Child Care. (Total savings = \$31,100,000^{18 19})

Administrative Cost Allowance – Alternative Payment Programs

Voucher-based contractors administrative and support services allowance has been reduced from 19 to 17.5 percent of their contract amount for a savings of \$17.1 million.

Center-based Reserve Accounts

Centers will be limited to a reserve account balance that is five percent of the sum of the contract maximum reimbursable amount. To achieve the cap, the Superintendent of Public Instruction is to offset the 2010-11 apportionments with funds maintain in the contractor's center-based reserve account within the child development fund as of June 30, 2010 and to continue until the reserve account balance is at five percent.²⁰

For More Information on 2010-11 Budget Bills: Impact on Children and Families

A number of organizations have developed overviews and analyses of the 2010-11 Budget as it impacts health and human services for children and families, including child care and development as follows:

California Budget Project

www.cbp.org

Child Development Policy Institute

www.cdpi.net

Legislative Analyst's Office

www.lao.ca.gov

Western Center on Law and Poverty

www.wclp.org

DRAFT

Endnotes:

¹ *California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.

² SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions, Approved: July 28, 2009.

³ SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010.

⁴ (research – is there money allocated elsewhere? Or what does this reflect?)

⁵ Latchkey was eliminated in 2009-10 Budget; funds provided services through August 31, 2009. Legislative intent provided for children displaced by the elimination of program receive services under the state's subsidized child care, After School and Education (ASES), or both.

⁶ (reflect message from budget bill re LPCs handling duties to extent possible)

⁷ Funds are available for child care as well as academic and supportive services.

⁸ ABX4 1, Sec. 439; 6110-196-001, provisions (3 and 4).

⁹ SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions, Approved: July 28, 2009.

¹⁰ SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010.

¹¹ One-time federal funding available for 2010-11. Remaining funds are to be used for child care and development quality expenditures as identified by the CDE, with approval of the Department of Finance.

¹² The budget relies completely on federal funding for this item.

¹³ \$75,000 for Health Hotline activities, \$81,000 for the infant-toddler specialist for the Hotline, and \$75,000 for technical assistance to providers for facility development until October 1, 2010.

¹⁴ Includes by not limited to those operated by public television stations in Redding, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Fresno, San Diego, and Eureka. Funds available until October 1, 2010.

¹⁵ *California State Budget 2010-11 Summary*, October 8, 2010.

¹⁶ The California Department of Education has issued Management Bulletin 10-10 with instructions to CalWORKs Stage 2 and 3 contractors on implementation of the Governor's veto of funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 funding. According to the Bulletin, "Because the Governor eliminated funding for CalWORKs Stage 3, the provisions of California Education Code Section 8263(c) regarding continuity of care do not apply for the families being terminated." The Bulletin continues by suggesting that families be register on their respective county's Centralized Eligibility List (CEL) and be informed as to how the CEL works.

¹⁷ Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles. *CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care Elimination – Over a \$400 Million Economic Impact on Los Angeles County*. October 11, 2010.

¹⁸ CalWORKs Stage 1 Child Care reduction is \$12.4 million; \$18.7 million reduction in remaining voucher-based programs.

¹⁹ While there were proposals introduced throughout the budget negotiations that would have resulted in other changes to the reimbursement rate, this was the only change. The cost of licensed child care services provided through the voucher-based programs, including Alternative Payment, will continue to be reimbursed at the 85th percentile of the rates charged by providers offering the same type of child care for the same age of the child in that region based on the 2005 Regional Market Rate Survey.

²⁰ SB 870, Chapter 712: 2010-11 Budget, Approved: October 8, 2010. (Section... 6110.196.0001, Provision 15(a). If the targeted savings of \$83,100,000 is not achieved through this effort, the California Department of Education may conduct quarterly analyses of fiscal and attendance reports for the 2010-11 fiscal year for all contracts and may adjust the contract maximum reimbursable amounts due to the underutilization of funds to reach the savings (Section6110.196.0001, Provision 15(b)).

CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care Elimination

Over a \$400 Million Economic Impact on
Los Angeles County

For every dollar (\$1) that has been invested in the CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care program, about \$4 is invested back into the Los Angeles County economy. Families who have been off of welfare have benefited by working and having access to quality early education and child care programs. On Friday, October 8, 2010 Governor Schwarzenegger in his completion of the 2010 to 2011 Budget, eliminated child care services for low income working families in CalWORKs Stage 3. This single act destroys California's 15 year investment in moving families from welfare to work and places thousands of California families on the unemployment and welfare rolls and leaves over 17,100 of Los Angeles County children without access to safe quality child care.



The immediate impacts of these cuts will include:

- Over **11,700 families** who are currently working, paying taxes and contributing to Sacramento's struggling economy will be forced to make difficult decisions between caring for their children or maintaining their employment .
- Nearly **6,000 of providers** paid, including licensed family child care homes and child care centers throughout the County will lose payment for services placing their businesses, already hard hit by the struggling economy at risk for closure.
- Over **\$400 Million annually** of economic input will be lost to Los Angeles County.

The massive elimination of child care services will result not only in lost employment for low income working parents and their child care teachers and providers, but also in endangered child safety and lost learning opportunities **for over 17,100 young children who will be removed** from their child care programs beginning November 1, 2010.



Child care providers are already struggling with high vacancy rates due to the 13% unemployment rate in Los Angeles County. The loss of an additional 17,100 children from these programs will place many licensed child care programs in very difficult financial positions and potential closure.

Further, these cuts will have a ripple effect of employers losing employees who are no longer able to come to work, closure of already struggling child care businesses which will impact all working families who depend upon child care services to go to work.

\$400 Million economic impact was calculated based on average monthly income of working Stage 3 parent (\$2,000 a month), payments made to providers and early educators on a monthly basis, and the income lost to employees working at agencies who will lose their jobs.



County of Los Angeles
Child Care Planning Committee and Policy Roundtable for Child Care



Office of Child Care

PUBLIC POLICY PLATFORM – FY 2011-12

Introduction

The Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) and Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) promote policies designed to increase the availability of and access to affordable, high quality early care and education programs for all children and their families of Los Angeles County. This public policy platform presents current and emerging policy issues in early care and education that are consistent with the County of Los Angeles State Legislative Agenda for the First Year of the Fiscal Year 2011-12. The platform identifies each of the legislative agenda items in **bold** followed by examples of efforts that may be addressed by proposed legislation and/or the proposed state budget.

Platform Issues

1. Support efforts to enhance the quality of early care and education that set high standards for all services and program types and address the needs of all children, including those with disabilities and other special needs, and their families.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Addressing the early care and education needs of children from birth through age 12, including infants and toddlers, preschool and school age children, and children with disabilities and other special needs up to age 22, and their families.
- Enhancing the quality of child care and development centers, family child care homes, and license-exempt care providers.
- Promoting a strengthening families approach to meet the needs of children at risk for abuse, neglect or sexual exploitation or under the supervision of the child welfare system and children of families under the supervision of Probation.
- Integrating early identification and intervention systems that recognize and respond early to young child who may be at risk for disabilities and other special needs.

2. Support efforts to develop and implement a statewide quality rating and improvement system and a system to adjust reimbursement rates based on demonstrated quality.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Promoting engagement of parents that supports their child's development and learning and providing parents with clear, concise information on the quality of child care and development settings.
- Encompassing early learning standards that are research-based, culturally responsive to children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, aligned with existing regulatory systems and local quality initiatives, recognize and respond to the individual needs of children in group settings, and attends to families' needs for comprehensive services.

- Building an infrastructure of technical assistance, financial supports and training, all of which are tied to defined quality standards, to help child care and development programs achieve and maintain high quality services.

3. Support efforts to develop and sustain a well educated, highly skilled and fairly compensated professional workforce prepared to serve the cultural and linguistically diverse child and family populations of Los Angeles County.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Focusing on teachers gaining skills and demonstrating competencies in the following areas: best practices in working with dual language learners, proficiency in recognition and response to children with disabilities and other special needs, engaging parents and guardians, and expertise on the spectrum of child development from birth through early adolescence. Workforce practice must be based on established early care and education foundations and research.
- Expanding early childhood educators' access to higher education through stipend programs, grant funds and loan forgiveness programs, higher compensation when they attain post-secondary degrees, and benefits (i.e. health insurance and retirement plans).
- Facilitating child development or early childhood education coursework coordination and articulation between the community colleges and California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems.
- Supporting efforts to enhance the quality of the license-exempt care workforce and facilitating connections between license-exempt care and the larger system of early care and education.
- Supporting alignment of teacher requirements under Title 22 with teacher requirements under Title 5.

4. Support efforts to ensure the health and safety of all children cared for in licensed early care and education facilities as afforded by timely, regular, and frequent on-site monitoring by the California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) at a reasonable cost to licensees.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Restoring inspections, at a minimum, to pre-2004 levels of child care and development centers annually and family child care homes triennially.
- Advocating for, at a minimum, annual unannounced inspections of all licensed facilities.
- Providing that CCLD is sufficiently funded, staffed and held accountable to meet the standards and provide technical assistance and resources to current and future licensees.



- Ensuring that costs of obtaining and renewing the license (or licenses for programs with multiple sites) are reasonable and not an extraordinary burden to the licensee's cost of doing business.

5. Support efforts to adequately fund high quality early care and education services for all children from low and moderate income families.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Increasing access to high quality subsidized child care and development services for all eligible children, including infants and toddlers and children with disabilities and other special needs as well as preschool and school age children.
- Increasing levels of reimbursement in the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) and the Regional Market Rate (RMR) to compensate providers for the true cost of high quality services.
- Developing a system to adjust reimbursement rates based on demonstrated quality.
- Increasing funds for expansion of high quality full-day, full-year services for all ages.
- Offering tax incentives to businesses to provide or pay for employee's child care.
- Ensuring that the income ceiling for eligibility for State subsidized care reflects the current State Median Income (SMI), adjusted by region if appropriate.
- Opposing proposals that would reduce subsidized child care rates based on geographic location.

6. Support efforts to streamline administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of child care and development funding to meet the needs of families.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Allowing administrative efficiencies such as multi-year contracting, grant-based funding, and waivers on program rules and regulations to allow flexibility of services based on community and family needs.
- Ensuring agencies have the capacity to connect with and serve the most vulnerable and the most difficult-to-serve families.
- Maintaining affordable family fees that do not exceed eight percent of gross family income.
- Funding Centralized Eligibility Lists (CELs) sufficiently to refine efforts to document actual need and eligibility, to effectively educate eligible families about the California system of subsidized child care and development and to facilitate families enrollment in subsidized programs.



- Allowing for various systems that serve vulnerable and low-income children and families to streamline administrative functions and share information in order to facilitate the enrollment of children in subsidized early care and education programs and to participate in joint data collection efforts.

7. Support efforts to expand the supply of appropriate early care and education services, including by integrating these services into city and county general plans.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Integrating child care and development in specific plans for land use, housing, transportation, economic, workforce, and community development.
- Facilitating the cost effective construction or renovation of child care and development facilities in communities with unmet needs for these services.

8. Support proposals designed to prevent, detect, investigate and, when appropriate, prosecute fraud in subsidized child care programs.

9. Support efforts to ensure that vulnerable children and their families have access to consistent, uninterrupted subsidized high quality early care and education services.

Such efforts should include, but not be limited to:

- Making sure that California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) families have access to high quality, consistent child care and development services that provide the children with school readiness skills, ensuring that participating families are afforded the time and information needed to evaluate their child care and development options and make sound choices, and that allow parents to pursue or maintain employment.
- Promoting, facilitating and supporting consistent and continuous participation of children under the supervision of the child welfare system and Probation and their families in high quality child care and development programs that promote healthy child development and support effective parenting.
- Ensuring that all subsidized children – infants and toddlers, preschool age, and school age children – and their families have access to consistent and continuous high quality child care and development services that partner with parents to promote children's healthy growth and development and prepare them for school and life, and meet the needs of families.
- Tackling the needs of pregnant and parenting teens to ensure their access to high quality child care and development services that support their academic goals, promote positive and effective parenting skills, and contribute to their child's healthy growth and development.





Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • www.childcare.lacounty.gov

Date: October 1, 2010

To: Gary Akopyan
Intergovernmental and External Affairs

From: Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Director
Office of Child Care
Service Integration Branch

Michele P. Sartell, Program Specialist III
Office of Child Care
Service Integration Branch

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES STATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA FOR 2011-12 - CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT

This memorandum outlines recommended revisions and updates to the County's State Legislative Agenda for 2011-12 to be submitted to the Board of Supervisor. The revisions are presented in two parts: 1) modest changes to the items listed in Section 1.3 Child Care Development; and 2) changes and additions to the sections that have direct impact on children and families through other service sectors - child welfare, parks, public health, mental health, CalWORKs, and homelessness. On Wednesday, September 8, 2010, the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) agreed unanimously to the recommendations; the Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) provided input to this version at their meeting on September 1, 2010.

Setting the stage, we have included a brief background that lends justification to the recommended revisions and additions of legislative agenda items to the service sector areas in addition to child care and development. In addition, we have identified preliminary areas for advocacy for the coming year based on the current budget climate and ongoing work on the development of an early learning quality improvement system.

Background

On January 6, 2009, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Child Care Policy Framework that includes among its goals, "Mobilize County Departments and stakeholders to incorporate access to high quality child care and development into services aimed at 1) preventing child abuse and neglect; 2) supporting family self sufficiency; and 3) promoting school and life success." A second goal focuses on collaboration to advance public policies to "ensure that children and their parents receive the child care and development and family support services needed to build strong foundations for healthy, productive lives." As such, the recommended revisions and augmentations contained in this memo further the County's Strategic Plan Goal of

Celia C. Ayala, Ph.D.
Maria Calix
Nancy Carter
Duane C. Dennis
Ann E. Franzen
Michael Gray

Whitcomb Hayslip
Carolee Howes, Ph.D.
Charlotte Lee
Kathleen Malaske-Samu
Jacquelyn McCroskey, D.S.W.



Carolyn Naylor
Terri Chew Nishimura, MA, OTR/L
Holly Reynolds
Matt Rezvani
Arlene Rhine

Connie Russell
Esther A. Torrez
Mika Yamamoto
Ruth M. Yoon
Sarah Younglove

Children, Family and Adult Well-Being by supporting the integration of County services with high quality child development programs that build upon the strengths of parents and promotes their children's optimal development.

Potential Priority Areas of Advocacy - 2011

During 2010, the Governor proposed significant cuts to child care and development services, including elimination of State funding for programs except State Preschool. Additionally, he proposed eliminating the CalWORKs program, which would effectively eliminate all support services, including child care, designed to help families transition to self-sufficiency. Current negotiations may result in the retention of programs, however at reduced levels. Moreover, the delayed budget has posed severe ramifications to the child care and development system. Some California Department of Education-contracted programs are curtailing services to low-income families until the budget is resolved and payments to programs resume while others are terminating their services completely. This year, efforts will concentrate on 1) preserving existing services and restoring funding to previous levels to ensure that low-income families continue to have access to high quality child care and development services that supports working families and promotes healthy child development; and 2) developing a mechanism for bridge funding to help programs weather future budget delays. In addition, advocacy will continue to support ongoing efforts to develop and implement of an early learning quality rating and improvement system that includes a quality rating scale.

Recommendations - 1.3 Child Care and Development

The recommended changes to the child care and development items are minor and are shaded in gray (see items 3 and 9 for inserted language). To support the recommendations attached is the Planning Committee and Roundtable's revised Public Policy Platform for FY 2011-12 (Platform). The Platform offers examples of efforts that may be addressed by proposed legislation and/or State budget during the upcoming Legislative Session.

1. Support efforts to enhance the quality of early care and education that set high standards for all services and program types and address the needs of all children including those with disabilities and other special needs, and their families.
2. Support efforts to develop and implement a statewide quality rating and improvement system and a system to adjust reimbursement rates based on demonstrated quality.
3. Support efforts to develop and sustain a well educated and highly skilled professional and **fairly compensated** workforce prepared to serve the cultural and linguistically diverse child and family populations of Los Angeles County.
4. Support efforts to ensure the health and safety of all children cared for in licensed early care and education facilities as afforded by timely, regular, and frequent on-site monitoring by the California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) **at a reasonable cost to licensees**.
5. Support efforts to adequately fund high quality early care and education services for all children from low and moderate income families.
6. Support efforts to streamline administrative processes to expand access for low-income families, ensure continuity of care, and promote flexible use of child care and development funding to meet the needs of families.

7. Support efforts to expand the supply of appropriate early care and education services by including these services in city and county general plans.
8. Support proposals designed to prevent, detect, investigate and, when appropriate, prosecute fraud in subsidized child care programs.
9. Support efforts to ensure that vulnerable children and their families have access to consistent, uninterrupted subsidized **high quality** early care and education services.

Recommendations - Child Welfare, Parks, Public Health, Mental Health, Calworks, and Homelessness

The following recommendations would support implementation of the Policy Framework to support the integration of child care and development services into services offered by County departments. The recommendations were vetted with representatives of the respective departments with whom we work. Suggested revisions to existing items are highlighted in gray; suggested additional items are indicated with bullets.

1.1 Child Welfare Services

8. Support funding for parenting programs **and access to high quality child development programs that strengthen parenting skills and promote optimal child development aimed at pregnant and parenting teens.**

2.4 Parks

New:

- Support proposals to fund programs at park facilities aimed at building social connections among parents and their community and provide accurate and timely information about child development and effective parenting strategies.

4.6 Public Health

New:

- Support measures that fund efforts that promote partnerships between preventative health programs and child care and development programs serving low- to moderate-income families that include but are not limited to facilitating enrollment, conducting health and developmental screenings and referrals for services, and ensuring immunizations are current.

8. Mental Health

New (or integrate with item 5)

- Support measures to fund mental health services for children (ages 0-5) in natural settings, including child care and development programs.

10.2 CalWORKs

13. Support proposals that simplify the CalWORKs Child Care Program to increase access to high quality programs that promote optimal child development and eliminate child care as a barrier to welfare-to-work activities and employment.

10.11 Homelessness

1. Support proposals which increase funding for homeless assistance programs, including supportive housing, supportive services, high quality child care and development, and emergency services, increase flexibility over the use of homeless assistance funds, simplify and reduce administrative requirements, and more equitably distribute funds based on relative need.

If you have any questions regarding these recommendations, please call Kathy at (213) 974-2440 or Michele at (213) 974-5187

KMS:MPS

cc: Olyvia Rodriguez, Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs
Ron Morales, Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs
Kathy House, Chief Executive Office
Lesley Blacher, Service Integration Branch/Chief Executive Office
Laura Escobedo, Child Care Planning Committee
Terri Chew Nishimura, Policy Roundtable for Child Care
Bobbie Edwards, Child Care Planning Committee



Policy Roundtable for Child Care

222 South Hill Street, Fifth Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-4103 • Fax: (213) 217-5106 • www.childcare.lacounty.gov

Date: October 5, 2010

To: Mark Tajima and Olyvia Rodriguez
Intergovernmental and External Affairs

From: Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Director
Office of Child Care
Service Integration Branch

Michele P. Sartell, Program Specialist III
Office of Child Care
Service Integration Branch

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FEDERAL AGENDA FOR THE 112TH CONGRESS – CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

This memorandum recommends changes to the existing County of Los Angeles Federal Legislative Agenda for the 112th Congress that will commence in January 2011. The changes are to items listed under Section 7 – Children and Family Services. In addition, we have summarized legislative initiatives and programs of interest to pursue during the next session.

On September 8, 2010, the Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) agreed to the revised recommendations; the Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) provided input to this version at their meeting on September 1, 2010. Two of the recommendations have been revised using broad language intended to capture efforts toward improving and increasing the availability of high quality child care and development services and addressing the needs of dual language learners. The recommended changes are highlighted in yellow.

7. Children and Family Services

- b. Support proposals and funding which would promote income security, housing, health care, **child care and development services**, and education and vocational opportunities for youth emancipating from foster care, and which would lower the age provision of the Independent Living Program to 14 years.
- m. Support proposals which provide funding **for before and after school programs administered by but not limited to state and local governments.**

Celia C. Ayala, Ph.D.
Maria Calix
Nancy Carter
Duane C. Dennis
Ann E. Franzen
Michael Gray

Whitcomb Hayslip
Carolee Howes, Ph.D.
Charlotte Lee
Kathleen Malaske-Samu
Jacquelyn McCroskey, D.S.W.



Carolyn Naylor
Terri Chew Nishimura, MA, OTR/L
Holly Reynolds
Matt Rezvani
Arlene Rhine

Connie Russell
Esther A. Torrez
Mika Yamamoto
Ruth M. Yoon
Sarah Younglove

- o. Support proposals and funding ~~for state and local government to increase the availability and quality of affordable child care and development services to more children and families to increase the availability of high quality affordable child care and development programs to more children and families administered by but not limited to state and local governments.~~
- p) Support proposals and funding to local school districts and child care and development programs to implement locally determined programs ~~to help educate children with limited English proficiency for dual language learners.~~

In addition, the Roundtable identified Federal budget items and legislative initiatives to pursue over the next year: 1) Early Head Start and Head Start; 2) the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG); 3) the Early Learning Challenge Fund; 4) Title I Grants for Low-Income Children; and 5) Individuals with Disabilities Act Part B (Preschool Grants) and Part C for infants and toddlers.

- 1) On July 15, 2010, the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education approved an \$866 million increase for Head Start and Early Head Start for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, one week later, went further by approving a \$990.3 million increase for the programs, continuing the additional funds provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Early Head Start and Head Start are comprehensive child development programs for children of low-income families.
- 2) On July 15, 2010, the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education approved a \$700 million increase for the CCDBG for FY 2011. One week later, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee approved a \$1 billion increase for the CCDBG, continuing the investment of funds provided under the ARRA. The federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) authorizes funds to states to improve the availability, affordability and quality of child care and development services for low-income families. ARRA provided new funding for child care and development programs, augmenting the CCDBG and including a set-aside for enhancing the quality of services with an allocation specifically earmarked for improving the quality of infant and toddler services.
- 3) The Senate Appropriations Committee also added \$300 million for the Early Learning Challenge Fund. Originally included in but later removed from the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2009 (H.R. 3221), this provision would establish two grants – the Quality Pathways Grant and the Development Grant – as incentives to States to develop and implement high quality early learning systems for children from birth to five and their families. Among the requirements of the grants is establishing a quality rating and improvement system.
- 4) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) or No Child Left Behind is a funding stream that may support a broad range of early care and education programs for low-income children under five years old. Efforts have been made to create a set-aside of Title I funds specifically for this population of children, most recently through the negotiations that resulted in the ARRA. Unfortunately, using Title I funds for early childhood education and comprehensive services for children from birth to five years old remains an option for school districts.

- 5) Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) provides federal funds to states and local communities to support free and appropriate education to students with disabilities. IDEA Preschool Grants provides funding to states for special education and related services for children with disabilities from three to five years old with the discretion to serve two year old children turning three within the school year. Part C of the IDEA provides federal funds to states to provide coordinated, comprehensive services to infants and toddlers at risk for or with developmental delays. Authorization for both Part B and Part C of IDEA is set to expire in 2011.

The Roundtable recommends tracking all four items and taking positions to support efforts designed to enhance the quality and increase the availability, access and affordability of child care and development services to children and their families.

In closing, the Roundtable is very committed to the integration of the revised and added items relating to child care and development into the County's Federal Agenda. If you or your staff have any questions or hesitations regarding the items, we would appreciate being notified so that we have an opportunity to discuss these items prior to the finalization of the Agenda. Please contact Kathy Malaske-Samu at (213) 974-2440 and/or Michele Sartell at (213) 974-5187.

KMS:MPS

cc: Kathy House, Chief Executive Office
Lesley Blacher, Service Integration Branch/Chief Executive Office
Laura Escobedo, Child Care Planning Committee
Terri Chew Nishimura, Policy Roundtable for Child Care
Bobbie Edwards, Child Care Planning Committee

From Silos to Systems: Connecting Child Development and County Sponsored Services

What is the status of the Los Angeles County Child Care Policy Framework?

The initial Child Care Policy Framework (Framework) adopted by the Board of Supervisors on January 6, 2009, identified **four** major goals including a charge to update the plan every two yearsⁱ. (Please see the endnotes for a complete listing of the goals.)

Over the past two years the Framework has served as catalyst for County departments to reexamine their practice models, develop new strategies to integrate child development services into their operations, and establish new partnerships with key organizations that provide early education including the Los Angeles County Office of Education Head Start (LACOE-HS) and Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Change has occurred! Staff persons in a number of County departments now understand the importance of strengthening families with young children through high quality early care and education. These departments have reached across systems and facilitated the enrollment of vulnerable young children into child development services.

As the process to update the Framework begins, the intent is to build on the “lessons learned” by the five leading County departments – the Departments of Children and Family Services (CDFS), Mental Health (DMH), Public Health (DPH), Public Social Services (DPSS), and Probation. Based on the progress made by these “pioneers”, we believe that the new framework should build on their successes and propose bold new strategies which connect children and their families to high quality child development services.

What was accomplished as a result of the Child Care Policy Framework adopted in 2009?

The first goal of the Framework is a call to:

“Mobilize County departments and stakeholders to incorporate access to high quality child care and development services into services aimed at: 1) preventing child abuse and neglect; 2) supporting family self sufficiency; and 3) promoting school and life success.”

This document focuses on the progress made by a number of County departments in integrating child development services into their work with children and families. Even in a time of fiscal uncertainty, many County staff members have demonstrated their commitment to strengthening our County’s most vulnerable families by providing resource information, cross-training staff and partners, simplifying access to Head Start and other early care and education resources, and focusing on high-need populations.

Unfortunately, the current State Budget crisis threatens these hard won accomplishments. If the supply of subsidized child development services is reduced, newly engaged County partners and their clients will face serious challenges in accessing services from a shrinking pool of care.

What lessons were learned while implementing the Child Care Policy Framework?

- 1. Lessons Learned:** Among the key departments, there is movement toward adopting the *Strengthening Families Approach* (SFA) and a focus on the *Protective Factors*ⁱⁱ. SFA is not about using a new model or starting a new prevention program: it is about engaging children and families as partners in preventing maltreatment and promoting optimal development.ⁱⁱⁱ The five Protective Factors are foundational to the SFA and include:

- Parental Resilience
- Social Connections
- Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development
- Concrete Supports in Times of Need
- Social and Emotional Competence

Representatives of the Center for the Study of Social Policy and other experts have been working intensely with executive staff from the Probation Department and DCFS on the SFA. In addition, the Birth to Five Program within DMH, and the Home Visitation Program within DPH have incorporated this approach and the related Protective Factors into their work. The SFA and the Protective Factors could provide County departments with a much needed common approach and shared language to work with children and families.

Future Strategies:

- Consistent with the Chief Executive Office's (CEO) mission to facilitate "effective program implementation" the CEO should further the integration of the SFA into County department practices by convening a SFA learning community for department heads in the Children, Family and Adult Well-being, Public Safety and the Health and Mental Health Clusters. Participants in this learning community should also include representatives of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools and Sheriff's Department and the County Commissions interacting with these departments.
- Work collaboratively with First 5 LA in both their place-based approach and countywide efforts to promote the SFA and the protective factors.
- The Policy Roundtable for Child Care (Roundtable) should serve as a cross-departmental forum for sharing and integrating the SFA into County activities.

- 2. Lessons Learned by the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS):** Working in collaboration with the LACOE-HS, DCFS piloted a variety of Head Start "enrollment drives" and found that Children's Services Workers were more likely to promote the use of child development services, and foster families were more likely to enroll children, when the application process was streamlined. These enrollment drives were targeted to areas where LACOE-HS programs were expanding. As a result, interested foster parents were connected to specific programs and were able to access services.

Future Strategies:

- Support both DCFS and LACOE-HS in their efforts to institutionalize the streamlined enrollment of DCFS families into Head Start programs. LACOE-HS has already initiated relationships with other Head Start grantees to facilitate access to Head Start services throughout the County.
- While enrollment is a critical step in providing vulnerable children access to needed services, consistent participation over time is essential for children to build the relationships and reap the benefits of early care and education. Therefore, it will be important for LACOE-HS and DCFS to monitor the actual participation rates of these children.
- Application processes have been shown to deter participation in other subsidized child development programs. Building on the work of DCFS and LACOE-HS, the Roundtable should work with departments and community stakeholders to explore ways to streamline access to other types of subsidized child development services, including but not limited to CalWORKs Child Care and California Department of Education funded services.

- 3. Lessons Learned by the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS):** DPSS has experienced severe pressure to minimize CalWORKs Child Care expenditures. Recognizing that children in homeless families are a priority population for LACOE-HS, DPSS has collaborated with LACOE-HS to facilitate homeless CalWORKs clients' access to Head Start services.

Future Strategies:

- Continue efforts to connect homeless families to LACOE-HS and other child development services.
- Work with DPSS and their contractors to connect high-need clients such as the children of CalWORKs clients receiving mental health, substance abuse or domestic violence services, and develop a process similar to that used by DCFS to streamline the application process and facilitate the enrollment of children in Head Start or other child development services.

- 4. Lessons Learned by the Probation Department:** Understanding how to access child development services for siblings of juvenile probationers and children of juvenile probationers has supported the Department's effort to adopt a "family engagement focus," modify the emerging "practice model" and to implement the SFA. By tapping into the resources of the "County family", i.e. the Office of Child Care and LACOE-HS, nearly 300 Deputy Juvenile Probation Officers received a full day of training on the SFA, early brain development, and the range of local child development resources. Working with the same collaborative partners, the Probation Department has identified a series of action steps to reinforce and expand the first year training activities.

Future Strategies:

- Conduct a limited number of part-day trainings for Deputy Probation Officers having direct and ongoing contact with young persons and their families.
- The Office of Child Care and LACOE-HS will collaborate to produce a quarterly electronic newsletter, focusing on SFA and local child development resources, which the Probation Department can distribute.
- Work with the two main residential programs for teen moms under the supervision of the Probation Department to ensure that these agencies have the information and community contacts necessary to assist clients in accessing child development services upon their release.

- 5. Lessons Learned by the Department of Mental Health (DMH):** The Birth to Five Program at DMH is committed to the SFA and to promoting the Protective Factors. These staff participate in a number of community networks and serve as a local resource for training on the Protective Factors.

- **Future Strategies:** As in other departments, support for the SFA tends to be centered in one section, division or bureau. Our challenge is to fully engage each of the departments who have demonstrated interest in the SFA and the Protective Factors, while also introducing other departments to this approach.

- 6. Lessons Learned by LACOE-Head Start (LACOE-HS):** By working closely with various County departments, LACOE-HS was able to recruit significant numbers of eligible children and fully enroll newly expanded programs. The ability to actually connect families to programs that were able to enroll children immediately has been incredibly powerful.

- **Future Strategies:** American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds supported the expansion of Head Start services. Advocacy is needed to retain these dollars and services.
- Continue to develop and refine relationships with other Head Start grantees to facilitate the enrollment of children and/or families receiving County services into their programs.

Where we are headed?

The process of mobilizing County departments to incorporate access to high quality child development services into their work with children and families is underway. We are moving from our silos and toward a system that includes a range of services. Fueled by the successes experienced to date, this work is gaining momentum and effective collaborations are evolving between County departments and child development stakeholders. We recognize that many serious challenges remain. Our strategy to address the next tier of challenges will be presented in the update to the Child Care Policy Framework. The update is due to the Board of Supervisors by early January 2011.

As the update to the Policy Framework is developed, attention will also be paid to the following:

- Strategies to deepen the commitment of County departments to the SFA through high quality early care and education
- Professional development practices that reinforce the principles, values and language of SFA
- Policies and practices that facilitate access to the full range of child development services for children and families receiving County services
- Collaborative relationships with the child development community that facilitate access to County services for vulnerable children and families
- Expanding the membership of the Roundtable to include representatives of Probation, DMH and DPH

ⁱ The four goals of the Child Care Policy Framework are:

1. Mobilize County departments and stakeholders to incorporate access to high quality child care and development services into services aimed at: 1) preventing child abuse and neglect; 2) supporting family self sufficiency; promoting school and life success.
2. Advance public policies at all levels of government, local, State, and Federal, which ensure that children and their parents receive the child care and development and family support services needed to build strong foundations for healthy, productive lives. Identify opportunities for Los Angeles County to promote collaboration among service providers and advocates on behalf of needed legislative or regulatory changes.
3. Facilitate the capacity of child care and development service providers, publicly and privately funded, to meet the child care and development needs of local families.
4. Update this plan every two years, on the anniversary of the Policy Framework's adoption.

ⁱⁱ The Center for the Study of Social Policy has identified the following program strategies to build protective factors: 1) Facilitate friendships and mutual support, 2) Strengthen Parenting, 3) Respond to family crisis, 4) Link families to services and opportunities, 5) Value and support parents, 6) Facilitate children's social and emotional development, and 7) Observe and respond to early warning signs of child abuse and neglect.

ⁱⁱⁱ "Levers for Change," Center for the Study of Social Policy,
[http://strengtheningfamilies.net/images/uploads/pdf_uploads/\(2.4\)_Levers_for_Change_.pdf](http://strengtheningfamilies.net/images/uploads/pdf_uploads/(2.4)_Levers_for_Change_.pdf)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: THURSDAY, SEPT. 16, 2010

Income, Poverty and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2009

Summary of Key Findings

The U.S. Census Bureau announced today that real median household income in the United States in 2009 was \$49,777, not statistically different from the 2008 median.

The nation's official poverty rate in 2009 was 14.3 percent, up from 13.2 percent in 2008 — the second statistically significant annual increase in the poverty rate since 2004. There were 43.6 million people in poverty in 2009, up from 39.8 million in 2008 — the third consecutive annual increase.

Meanwhile, the number of people without health insurance coverage rose from 46.3 million in 2008 to 50.7 million in 2009, while the percentage increased from 15.4 percent to 16.7 percent over the same period.

These findings are contained in the report *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2009*. The following results for the nation were compiled from information collected in the 2010 Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC):

Income

Race and Hispanic Origin (Race data refer to people reporting a single race only. Hispanics can be of any race.)

- Among race groups, Asian households had the highest median income in 2009. Real median income declined between 2008 and 2009 for non-Hispanic white and black households, while the changes for Asian and Hispanic-origin households were not statistically different. (See Table A [PDF].)

Regions

- In 2009, households in the West and Northeast had the highest median household incomes. (The apparent difference between the two regions was not statistically significant.) Real median income declined between 2008 and 2009 in the Midwest and West; the changes for the Northeast and South were not statistically significant. (See Table A [PDF].)

Nativity

- In 2009, households maintained by naturalized citizens had the highest median income. Native-born households and those maintained by noncitizens experienced income declines from 2008 to 2009, in real terms. The changes in the median income of all foreign-born households and households maintained by a naturalized citizen were not statistically significant. (See Table A [PDF].)


Earnings

- In 2009, the earnings of women who worked full time, year-round were 77 percent of that for corresponding men, not statistically different from the 2008 ratio.
- The real median earnings of men who worked full time, year-round rose by 2.0 percent between 2008 and 2009, from \$46,191 to \$47,127. For women, the corresponding increase was 1.9 percent, from \$35,609 to \$36,278. (The difference between the 2.0 and 1.9 percent increases was not statistically significant.)

Income Inequality

- The change in income inequality between 2008 and 2009 was not statistically significant, as measured by shares of aggregate household income by quintiles and the Gini index. The Gini index was 0.468 in 2009. (The Gini index is a measure of household income inequality; 0 represents perfect income equality and 1 perfect inequality.)

Poverty

Release Information
CB010-144
Contact: Public Information Office 301-763-3030/763-3691 763-3762 (fax)
Media kit/Report Income data Poverty data Health insurance coverage data
Subscribe for Updates
BY RSS: What's this?  Income & Wealth

- The poverty rate in 2009 was the highest since 1994, but was 8.1 percentage points lower than the poverty rate in 1959, the first year for which poverty estimates are available. The number of people in poverty in 2009 is the largest number in the 51 years for which poverty estimates are available.
- In 2009, the family poverty rate and the number of families in poverty were 11.1 percent and 8.8 million, respectively, up from 10.3 percent and 8.1 million in 2008.
- The poverty rate and the number in poverty increased across all types of families: married-couple families (5.8 percent and 3.4 million in 2009 from 5.5 percent and 3.3 million in 2008); female-householder-with-no-husband-present families (29.9 percent and 4.4 million in 2009 from 28.7 percent and 4.2 million in 2008) and for male-householder-no-wife-present families (16.9 percent and 942,000 in 2009 from 13.8 percent and 723,000 in 2008).

Thresholds

- As defined by the Office of Management and Budget and updated for inflation using the Consumer Price Index, the weighted average poverty threshold for a family of four in 2009 was \$21,954. Since the average annual CPI-U for 2009 was lower than the average annual CPI-U for 2008, poverty thresholds for 2009 are slightly lower than the corresponding thresholds for 2008. (See http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032010/pov/new35_000.htm for the complete set of dollar value thresholds that vary by family size and composition.)

Race and Hispanic Origin (Race data refer to people reporting a single race only. Hispanics can be of any race.)

- The poverty rate for non-Hispanic whites was lower in 2009 than it was for other racial groups. The poverty rate is not statistically different from the 2008 poverty rate for Asians, but increased for all other race groups and for Hispanics. Table B [PDF] details 2009 poverty rates and numbers in poverty, as well as changes since 2008 in these measures, for race groups and Hispanics.

Age

- The poverty rate increased for children younger than 18 (from 19.0 percent in 2008 to 20.7 percent in 2009) and people 18 to 64 (from 11.7 percent in 2008 to 12.9 percent in 2009), while it declined for people 65 and older (from 9.7 percent in 2008 to 8.9 percent in 2009).
- Similar to the patterns observed for the poverty rate in 2009, the number of people in poverty increased for children younger than 18 (14.1 million in 2008 to 15.5 million in 2009) and people 18 to 64 (22.1 million in 2008 to 24.7 million in 2009) and declined for seniors 65 and older (from 3.7 million in 2008 to 3.4 million in 2009).

Nativity

- The 2009 poverty rate for naturalized citizens was not statistically different from 2008, while the poverty rates of native-born and noncitizens increased. Table B [PDF] details 2009 poverty rates and the numbers in poverty, as well as changes since 2008 in these measures, by nativity.

Regions

- The poverty rate increased from 2008 to 2009 in the Midwest, South and West while all four regions had increases in the number of people in poverty. (The 2009 poverty rate for the Northeast was not statistically different from its 2008 poverty rate.) (See Table B [PDF].)

Health Insurance Coverage

- The number of people with health insurance decreased from 255.1 million in 2008 to 253.6 million in 2009. Since 1987, the first year that comparable health insurance data were collected, this is the first year that the number of people with health insurance has decreased.
- Between 2008 and 2009, the number of people covered by private health insurance decreased from 201.0 million to 194.5 million, while the number covered by government health insurance climbed from 87.4 million to 93.2 million. The number covered by employment-based health insurance declined from 176.3 million to 169.7 million. The number with Medicaid coverage increased from 42.6 million to 47.8 million.
- Comparable health insurance data were first collected in 1987. The percentage of people covered by private insurance (63.9 percent) is the lowest since that year, as is the percentage of people covered by employment-based insurance (55.8 percent). In contrast, the percentage of people covered by government health insurance programs (30.6 percent) is the highest since 1987, as is the percentage covered by Medicaid (15.7 percent).
- In 2009, 10.0 percent (7.5 million) of children under 18 were without health insurance. Neither estimate is significantly different from the corresponding 2008 estimate.
- The uninsured rate for children in poverty (15.1 percent) was greater than the rate for all children.
- In 2009, the uninsured rates decreased as household income increased: from 26.6 percent for those in households with annual incomes less than \$25,000 to 9.1 percent in households with incomes of \$75,000 or more.

Race and Hispanic Origin (Race data refer to those reporting a single race only. Hispanics can be of any race.)

- The uninsured rate and number of uninsured in 2009 were not statistically different from 2008 for Asians while increasing for all other race groups and for Hispanics. (See Table C [PDF].)

Nativity

- The proportion of the foreign-born population without health insurance in 2009 was nearly two-and-a-half times that of the native-born population. The uninsured rate was not statistically different for naturalized citizens but rose for noncitizens and the native-born. Table C [PDF] details the 2009 uninsured rate and the number of uninsured, as well as changes since 2008 in these measures, by nativity.

Regions

- The Northeast had the lowest uninsured rate in 2009. Between 2008 and 2009, the uninsured rates and number of uninsured increased in all four regions. (See Table C [PDF].)

The Census Bureau's statistical experts, with assistance from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, the Economics and Statistics Administration and other appropriate agencies and outside experts, are now developing a Supplemental Poverty Measure. The Supplemental Poverty Measure will provide an additional measure of economic well-being. It will not replace the official poverty measure and will not be used to determine eligibility for government programs. See *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2009*, for more information.

The Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement is subject to sampling and nonsampling errors. All comparisons made in the report have been tested and found to be statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted.

For additional information on the source of the data and accuracy of the estimates for the CPS, visit http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60_238.pdf.

Table A. Median Household Income

Region	2008 (in 2009 dollars)	2009	Percent change in real median income
U.S.	\$50,112	\$49,777	-0.7
Northeast	\$54,140	\$53,073	-2.0
Midwest	\$49,922	\$48,877	*-2.1
South	\$45,417	\$45,615	0.4
West	\$54,876	\$53,833	*-1.9

Race and Hispanic Origin of Householder

White	\$52,113	\$51,861	-0.5
White, not Hispanic	\$55,319	\$54,461	*-1.6
Black	\$34,088	\$32,584	*-4.4
Asian	\$65,388	\$65,469	0.1
Hispanic origin (any race)	\$37,769	\$38,039	0.7

Nativity of Householder

Native born	\$50,862	\$50,503	*-0.7
Foreign born	\$43,328	\$43,923	1.4
Naturalized citizen	\$51,328	\$51,975	1.3
Not a citizen	\$37,807	\$36,089	*-4.5

*Change statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level.

Table B. People in Poverty
(Numbers in thousands)

Region	2008		2009		Change in poverty	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent

U.S.	39,829	13.2	43,569	14.3	*3,740	*1.1
Northeast	6,295	11.6	6,650	12.2	*355	0.6
Midwest	8,120	12.4	8,768	13.3	*648	*0.9
South	15,862	14.3	17,609	15.7	*1,747	*1.4
West	9,552	13.5	10,542	14.8	*990	*1.3

Race and Hispanic Origin

White	26,990	11.2	29,830	12.3	*2,841	*1.1
White, not Hispanic	17,024	8.6	18,530	9.4	*1,506	*0.8
Black	9,379	24.7	9,944	25.8	*565	*1.1
Asian	1,576	11.8	1,746	12.5	*169	0.6
Hispanic origin	10,987	23.2	12,350	25.3	*1,363	*2.1

Nativity

Native born	33,293	12.6	36,407	13.7	*3,114	*1.1
Foreign born	6,536	17.8	7,162	19.0	*626	*1.3
Naturalized citizen	1,577	10.2	1,736	10.8	160	0.6
Not a citizen	4,959	23.3	5,425	25.1	*466	*1.8

*Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Table C. People Without Health Insurance Coverage
(Numbers in thousands)

	2008		2009		Change	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Region						
U.S.	46,340	15.4	50,674	16.7	*4,335	*1.3
Northeast	6,277	11.6	6,789	12.4	*512	*0.8
Midwest	7,588	11.6	8,770	13.3	*1,181	*1.7
South	20,154	18.2	22,105	19.7	*1,951	*1.5
West	12,321	17.4	13,011	18.3	*690	*0.9
Race and Hispanic Origin						
White	34,890	14.5	38,399	15.8	*3,509	*1.4
White, not Hispanic	21,322	10.8	23,658	12.0	*2,336	*1.2
Black	7,284	19.1	8,102	21.0	*818	*1.8
Asian	2,344	17.6	2,409	17.2	65	-0.4
Hispanic origin	14,558	30.7	15,820	32.4	*1,263	*1.7
Nativity						
Native	34,036	12.9	37,694	14.1	*3,658	*1.3
Foreign born	12,304	33.5	12,980	34.5	*677	*1.0
Naturalized citizen	2,792	18.0	3,044	19.0	*252	1.0
Not a citizen	9,511	44.7	9,936	46.0	*425	*1.3

*Change statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level.

-X-

III. The Council's Action Agenda: Strategies for Increasing the Number of Children Ready for Kindergarten

California's action agenda recognizes that improving outcomes for children will demand a collaborative approach, and a real commitment of time and energy. The purpose of this action agenda is to provide a framework for that commitment of time and energy, and to ensure that our efforts lead to real policy change. This outline of the action agenda is divided into two sections: (A) The Council's objectives for the grant; (B) California's strategies for increasing the number of children entering school ready to learn, and the activities the Council can undertake in support of its strategies, including the activities to be funded through the HHS grant.

A. The Council's Objectives for the Grant

The Council's primary objectives for its grant fall into three broad categories: (1) Develop a comprehensive statewide plan for an integrated early learning system; (2) Connect with children and families; and (3) Implement the QRIS, including improving the quality of interactions in early learning settings.

- *Develop a comprehensive plan for an integrated system.* In a state as large and diverse as California, and in a field like early childhood that has at times in its history been deeply fragmented, the idea of a unified vision for early childhood systems is enormously powerful. California has never had a long-term plan focused on the needs of children and families (particularly unserved and underserved families) that ties together multiple programs. A comprehensive birth-to-five vision for early childhood education and school preparedness in California would provide a north star for future policy change.
- *Connect with children and families.* We know that many parents choose to access publicly-supported early education and care services, but at this time we do not

know which children are in which programs. To help parents access services more effectively, we need to provide better information and resources to those parents. A unified early childhood data system will support parents and educators with better information on how to improve child outcomes, will provide policymakers with better data to drive their decision-making, and will allow for improved research into the short- and long-term impact of early childhood services.

- In addition, as the state moves toward the implementation of a new Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), it will work with families to determine how best to help them utilize that system.
- *Implement the QRIS, including improving the quality of interactions in early learning settings.* Each year children in California spend tens of millions of hours with early childhood professionals. The quality of those interactions has an enormous impact on their development and chance for long term success. The state's forthcoming QRIS system and its Early Childhood Educator Competencies will help drive improvements in the quality of the state's early learning programs and workforce – improvements that will require changes to how professionals are prepared and supported.

Achieving these objectives will require collaboration across a wide spectrum of early learning stakeholders and a strong partnership with the K-12 community.

B. Strategies for Increasing the Number of Children Entering Kindergarten Prepared

For each of its objectives, California will have a strategy and activities designed to increase the number of children entering kindergarten ready to learn.

most effectively use existing resources and attract new resources, including federal funds, in order to improve program quality and child outcomes, with a focus on the importance of attracting and retaining effective and well trained professionals. The comprehensive plan will also build on the work of CAEL QIS by identifying the new QRIS system as a driver of system change.

The current fiscal climate does not allow for the immediate infusion of additional state resources. Therefore, the comprehensive plan will address the utilization of existing resources, to ensure that the use of those resources is effectively serving the state's goals. The comprehensive plan also will discuss the respective roles of parents, governments (including federal, state, and local), the private sector, and the many partners who support the work of early education and care in California.

In sum, the comprehensive plan will be a system design and action plan quite unlike anything California has had before.

b. Specific Activities

- The Council will lead a statewide conversation about the needs of young children and their families. As part of that conversation, the Council will identify which needs are appropriately served by government-funded programs. This discussion will involve public meetings in different parts of the state, and invitations to a wide range of constituents to participate.
 - The Council will start the discussion with a draft of a broad vision so that the series of statewide conversations will have greater structure. The Council has sufficient expertise to prepare a "rough draft" of a vision to facilitate public conversation, with the expectation that the draft will evolve through the course of

Council discussions and public input. The plan will be aspirational and long-term (5 to 10 years), with the idea that while resources may not be currently available to implement some elements of the plan, having the plan will allow the state to make better decisions about its use of resources.

- Although the discussion will not be limited by some of the parameters that defined the CAEL QIS process, the final CAEL QIS report will inform the comprehensive plan. The Council will seek to keep to an absolute minimum the revisiting of recommendations made by CAEL QIS.
- The state will conduct an analysis of existing research on the state's current early childhood offerings, and use the findings from a meta-analysis (and any other available resources) to describe a baseline of where the state's early childhood work currently stands. The Council also will identify whether there is any key baseline information that existing research does not provide – and if so, will work with partners to develop the necessary baseline information. In developing a set of baseline data, the Council will focus on that information needed to address the Council's goals and objectives.
 - The analysis of the state's current status will include an overview of conditions for all children, but will also include an analysis of conditions for children in different "subgroups" under federal education law – particularly those subgroups whose K-12 performance is below state averages. One major purpose of the comprehensive plan is to recommend improvements in service to those children. This analysis must be cognizant of California's extraordinarily diverse population, including the many children whose primary home language is not English.

- The state will also analyze the current condition of higher education preparation programs, other training programs, and professional development. The Council recognizes that California's preparation and professional development efforts need to effectively serve the full range of early childhood providers across multiple programs and settings. The comprehensive plan will address the state's needs in these areas, including how to provide training and credentials to professionals already working in the field, and how to offer basic skills education and courses at times and in a manner that is accessible to current and potential providers.
- The Council is strongly committed to improving conditions for infants and toddlers. In June 2010, the CAEL QIS Advisory Committee considered a new "Infant/Toddler Early Learning and Care Needs Assessment," prepared by the American Institutes for Research. The Council's comprehensive plan will include infants and toddlers in its visioning, baseline analysis, and action planning.
- With the vision and the baseline data in hand, the Council will develop a roadmap for moving the state from where it is to where it plans to be. That roadmap will include recommendations for yearly benchmarks to ensure that the state is progressing toward its vision.
- The Council also will make recommendations on the tools providers need to reach the expected levels of quality, and for providing public information about the results of the state's quality improvement efforts. The Council will specifically discuss the level of resources needed to implement higher levels of quality, given the state's goals for child access to existing programs; in so doing, the Council will consider the need for high-quality personnel.

b. Specific Activities

Based on the Competencies and the work of CAEL QIS, the projects identified by the Council to implement QRIS include:

- Developing a common course of study for higher education based upon the Competencies, and designing a coherent professional development system that aligns to the Competencies and builds on recommendations made by CAEL QIS. The course of study also will be aligned to the Early Learning Foundations and its frameworks. The project may include a plan for a system that allows alternative providers to offer certain courses. This project will support the state's efforts to implement QRIS and increase the number of high-quality settings.
- QRIS pilot projects. These pilot projects will be guided by the final recommendations to be issued by CAEL QIS at the end of 2010. Based on recommendations from the RAND Corporation, the state may undertake "virtual piloting" using available databases, testing different design options based on existing data. The state will implement a full-scale, multi-site pilot of the QRIS system, with an embedded evaluation. The evaluation will include measuring the gains toward kindergarten readiness.
 - While the lessons learned from the QRIS pilot and evaluation will provide valuable information to support a statewide rollout by state agencies and providers, the Council would like a specific focus on how the QRIS can be made meaningful to families -- particularly families of those children identified as a priority for improved early childhood services. Accordingly, the Council will allocate funds to support focus groups with families to

develop recommendations on how the QRIS system can best be made accessible.

- In designing a pilot project, the Council will take into account numerous issues that will affect the scalability of the system design, including the system's ability to serve underrepresented and special populations. Ultimately the QRIS system must drive improvements in both quality and access to be successful.
- The Council will choose pilot sites in a manner that will maximize the impact of the pilot. Head Start and Early Head Start programs will be among those encouraged to seek participation in the pilot.

c. Budget Range

i. Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies

The recommended project in this area is to incorporate the newly developed Early Childhood Educator Competencies into the Early Childhood Education (ECE) course work of Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), and alternative providers – and to integrate them into the professional development activities identified in California's Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) State Plan. It would also ensure that California's early learning foundations, curriculum frameworks, and assessment system components are appropriately integrated into IHEs' ECE coursework and training content and teaching strategies of the CCDF professional development providers. This work will be instrumental in developing a coherent and articulated statewide system for educating and training our workforce and providing quality professional development.

In developing a budget for the Educator Competencies project, the Council has considered the work of the ECE competencies project, the Faculty Initiative Project, and a proposed budget for the Higher Education Council that includes California State Universities and community colleges. Based on materials from those efforts, the Council's project is estimated to cost \$1,163,269 over the next three years.

ii. Piloting QRIS elements

The proposal includes a budget of \$7,065,431 for piloting the QRIS system that will be fully designed by the end of 2010 and put forward by the CAEL QIS Advisory Committee. The pilot design will focus on field testing the implementation of the CAEL QIS-recommended system. The multi-site pilot will help the Council learn where the QRIS design may need to be adjusted, and how the implementation process might be streamlined and improved. The pilot will assess numerous factors, including how well the key QRIS components are being measured and implemented; the adequacy of staff ratios and group sizes; technical assistance, parent engagement, and other infrastructure elements for the system; improvements in kindergarten readiness; and the effectiveness of the compensation and incentive structure in driving higher levels of quality. Pilot results will supply lessons learned that might suggest changes to the design of the QRIS or to the scaling up of implementation.

IV. Personnel, Budget, and Work Plan

A. Name/Agency Affiliation of Council Members

Name	Title	Agency	Federal Requirement Met
Geno Flores, Tri-Chair*	Chief Deputy	California Department of Education	Agency responsible for child care programs
Anne McKinney, Tri-Chair	Deputy Secretary	Office of the Secretary of Education	
Kris Perry, Tri-Chair	Executive Director	California Children and Families Commission	
Celia Ayala	Chief Operating Officer	Los Angeles Universal Preschool	
Ernest "Toby" Boyd*	Kindergarten Teacher	Elk Grove Unified School District	Representative of LEA
Joan Buchanan	Assembly Member	State Assembly	
Zulmara Cline*	Associate Director	California State University Chancellor's Office	Institutions of Higher Education
Consuelo Espinosa	Infant/Toddler Specialist	WestEd	
Venus Garth	Chief	California Department of Social Services	
David W. Gordon*	Superintendent	Sacramento County Office of Education	Representative of LEA ²⁸
Jane Henderson*	Consultant		Health, mental health representative
David P. Lopez*	President	National Hispanic University (also Board Member, State Board of Education)	State Educational Agency representative
Cliff Marcussen*	Executive Director	Options – A Child Care and Human Services Agency	Local provider of early childhood education
Jeannie Oropeza	Program Budget Manager	California Department of Finance	
Nancy Remley*	Director	California Head Start Collaboration Office	State Head Start Collaboration Office
Lois Salisbury	Director	The David and Lucile Packard Foundation	
Dennis Vicars*	Chief Executive Officer	Human Services Management Corporation	Local provider of early childhood education
Sarah Younglove*	Director	Los Angeles County Office of Education	Local Head Start agency

*Membership on Council mandated by statute

²⁸ In addition to Ernest Boyd and David Gordon, Yolie Flores, Board Member, Los Angeles Unified School District, was initially appointed to the Council as an LEA representative. However, she resigned prior to the Council's July 13 meeting. Her replacement is pending.

B. Goals, Objective, Activities, and Timelines for Each Year of Grant (Three Years; Projections of Accomplishments)

The following chart explains the timeline (beginning October 2010), activities, and accomplishments for the work described in this application.

Quarter 1 - October 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	ELAC develops vision statement for coordinated early childhood system Consultant hired to conduct meta-analysis of current system	Consultant contract completed
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Write up request for procurement for a contractor to conduct a needs assessment	Hire the contractor (Oct 1, 2010- April 1, 2010)
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Develop scope of work for extending the work of the Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP) & the Baccalaureate Pathways to Early Childhood Education (BPECE) to include the integration of the ECE competencies into ECE coursework. Develop scope of work for Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies into the early learning (EL) professional development (PD) system	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	ELAC determines scope of work for pilot sites Staff develops RFP for pilot sites and for evaluation of pilots RFPs released	ELAC approves scope of work for pilots

Quarter 2 - January 1, 2011 to March 31, 2011

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	ELAC discusses and approves vision statement Consultant conducts meta-analysis and develops baseline report	Vision statement approved
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Council finalizes broad policy instructions for contractor, informed by work of CAEL QIS (identifying key policy needs of system) Continue staff work to hire contractor	Broad policy direction finalized
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Present integration plan to ELAC Contracts for competencies integration in IHEs and EL PD system	Executed contracts
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Staff scores proposals and announces awards	Pilot sites and evaluator identified

Quarter 3 – April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	<p>Begin planning for statewide public meetings regarding needs of young children & families (needs assessment)</p> <p>Consultant and staff draft outline of comprehensive plan to be used in public meetings</p> <p>ELAC reviews and approves draft outline of comprehensive plan</p>	Draft outline of comprehensive plan approved
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	<p>Contractor begins work which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying data collection requirements • Identifying data use requirements • Interviewing CDE staff and stakeholders • Proposed technological options to meet identified needs • Develop business rules on the issuance of the Unique Identifier (UI) • Providing status reports at agreed upon intervals 	
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Begin integration process with the core eight classes and with first set of EL PD programs	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Complete contracts to pilot sites and evaluation contractor	Contracts completed

Quarter 4 – July 1, 2011 to September 30, 2011

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	ELAC and staff conduct series of focus groups and statewide public meetings on needs of families (needs assessment)	Statewide meetings initiated
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Contractor continues work	
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Continue with phase one of integration	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Pilots begin Year One Evaluator begins work	Work begins in pilots

Quarter 5 – October 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	ELAC and staff conduct series of focus groups and statewide public meetings on needs of families (needs assessment)	Statewide meetings completed
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Contractor continues work	
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Complete phase one of integration Present result of first phase to ELAC	Presentation to ELAC
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Pilots continue – update to ELAC	

Quarter 6 – January 1, 2012 to March 31, 2012

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	Draft of Comprehensive Plan presented to ELAC	Draft comprehensive plan completed
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Contractor continues work	
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Begin phase two of integration	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Pilots continue – update to ELAC	

Quarter 7 –April 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	Final staff and consultant work on Comprehensive Plan based on ELAC revisions	Comprehensive Plan approved
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System		Contractor to provide a report containing recommendations
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Continue phase two of integration	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Pilots continue – update to ELAC	

Quarter 8 – July 1, 2012 to September 30, 2012

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	ELAC presents final draft to the Governor, Senate Subcommittee on Early Learning, Assembly Education Committee, and/or any other appropriate legislative committees	ELAC plan considered by Governor and Legislature
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Council to consider options presented by contractor	Council makes a recommendation on which option to pursue
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Complete phase two Present results of second phase to ELAC	Presentation to ELAC
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Pilots continue – update to ELAC	

Quarter 9 – October 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	Prepare draft package of legislative changes based on Comprehensive Plan	Council considers package of proposed changes
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System	Pursue implementation of the recommended alternative to issue the UI Initiate discussions on any governance issues necessary to implement recommended alternative	
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Begin phase three of integration	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Evaluator's interim report on pilots submitted to ELAC	Interim report on pilots completed, submitted to ELAC

Quarter 10 – January 1, 2013 to March 31, 2013

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	Package of legislative changes submitted for consideration	Draft legislation introduced
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System		
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Continue phase three of integration	
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Pilots continue – update to ELAC	

Quarter 11 – April 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	Legislature continues to consider proposed legislative changes	
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System		
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Complete phase three Present result of third phase to ELAC	Presentation to ELAC
	QRIS Pilot Projects	QRIS pilots end; evaluation report completed	Evaluation report completed

Quarter 12 – July 1, 2013 to September 30, 2013

Objective	Area	Activities	Accomplishments
Develop a Comprehensive Plan for an Integrated System	Prepare a Comprehensive Plan	Follow-up from any legislative changes adopted	
Connect with Children and Families	Unified Data Collection System		
Establish the QRIS to Improve the Quality of Early Learning Settings	Developing a Coherent Preparation, Training, & Professional Development System Built on the ECE Competencies	Develop rubric for integration ECE competencies into future ECE coursework and EL PD activities	Rubric for integrating ECE competencies into future ECE coursework and EL PD activities
	QRIS Pilot Projects	Final report on QRIS pilots submitted to ELAC ELAC considers evaluation report; drafts recommendations for Legislature/Governor	Final recommendations on QRIS to Legislature and Governor

C. Plans for Needs Assessment, Public Hearings, SAC Meetings

The ELAC held two public hearings to receive testimony on the federal application due August 1, 2010, to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The strategic report (attached in the appendices) was used as the basis of the public hearings.

The first public hearing took place on June 21, 2010, at the Yolo County Office of Education, 1280 Santa Anita Court, Woodland, CA from 2:00 to 7:00 p.m. Council members present were Tri-Chair Kris Perry, Camille Maben (on behalf of the Superintendent of Public Instruction), Consuela Espinosa, Venus Garth, and Jeannie Oropeza. The second public hearing took place June 23, 2010, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education, 9300 Imperial Highway, Downey, CA from 2:00 to 7:00 p.m. Council members present were: Zee Cline, Cliff

BUDGET INFORMATION - Non-Construction Programs

OMB Approval No. 0348-0044

SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY

Grant Program Function or Activity (a)	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		Total (g)
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	
1. Pilots		\$ 200,000.00	\$ 466,667.00	\$	\$	\$ 666,667.00
2.						0.00
3.						0.00
4.						0.00
5. Totals		\$ 200,000.00	\$ 466,667.00	\$ 0.00	\$	\$ 666,667.00

SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES

6. Object Class Categories	GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY					Total (5)
	(1)	(2)	(3)			
a. Personnel	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	0.00
b. Fringe Benefits						0.00
c. Travel						0.00
d. Equipment						0.00
e. Supplies						0.00
f. Contractual		200,000.00				200,000.00
g. Construction						0.00
h. Other						0.00
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)		200,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	200,000.00
j. Indirect Charges						0.00
k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)	\$	200,000.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 200,000.00
7. Program Income	\$	0.00	\$	\$	\$	0.00

Authorized for Local Reproduction

SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES					
(a) Grant Program	(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e) TOTALS	
8. State Preschool	\$ 466,667.00	\$	\$	\$	466,667.00
9.					0.00
10.					0.00
11.					0.00
12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)	\$ 466,667.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	466,667.00
SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS					
	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
13. Federal	\$ 0.00	\$	\$	\$	\$
14. Non-Federal	0.00				
15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT					
(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (Years)				
	(b) First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth	
16. State Preschool	\$	\$	\$ 200,000.00	\$	
17.					
18.					
19.					
20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16-19)	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$	0.00
SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION					
21. Direct Charges:	22. Indirect Charges:				
23. Remarks:					

California proposes to use its supplemental award to strengthen its pilot project to implement a Quality Rating and Improvement System. California's original application identified the need for the pilots, which will draw on the work of the statutorily-created California Early Learning Quality Improvement System Advisory Committee (CAEL QIS). The original application noted that at this time it is impossible to prepare a detailed work plan for the pilot project, as CAEL QIS will complete its QRIS design recommendations. The Council requested \$7,065,441 to pilot the new system, recognizing that a multi-site pilot will be an extremely complicated undertaking.

California's original narrative indicated that "given the scope of CAEL QIS and the many different possible approaches to pilot design, that budget will not be enough for the pilot to answer all of the potential QRIS implementation questions. The Council will consider the work of CAEL QIS to determine which questions it believes are most important to address; the Council will then turn to designing and preparing the infrastructure for a pilot that will address those questions." Given that the supplemental award is comparatively small in the context of California's overall allocation, adding it to the pilot projects will allow for some greater flexibility in pilot design, and potentially allow the state to learn more from the pilot project. Given the central importance of the pilot project and the success of the CAEL QIS recommendations, the Council would like to give the project its best chance to succeed.

The Council proposes to add the supplemental award to the final year of the grant, in order to maximize the Council's ability to take advantage of the early lessons of the pilot. As with the other expenses designated for the pilot project, these funds will be considered contractual for purposes of the grant. Because final timelines and benchmarks have not been

established for the full pilot project, final timelines and benchmarks for the supplemental grant will be developed concurrently with those for the main project.

The state is also able to provide the full \$466,667 in required matching funds.

Below is a revised project budget table with the relevant line items changed (shown in underlined text):

Category	Year 1 Amount	Comment	Year 2 Amount	Comment	Year 3 Amount	Comment	Total
Personnel	\$ 71,000	RPS II	\$ 71,000	RPS II	\$ 71,000	RPS II	\$ 213,000
Fringe	\$ 25,000	RPS II	\$ 25,000	RPS II	\$ 25,000	RPS II	\$ 75,000
Travel	\$ -	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
Equipment	\$ -	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
Supplies	\$ -	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
<i>Comprehensive Plan</i>	<i>\$ 400,020</i>		<i>\$ 199,980</i>		<i>\$ -</i>		<i>\$ 600,000</i>
<i>Data</i>	<i>\$ 550,000</i>		<i>\$ 550,000</i>		<i>\$ 550,000</i>		<i>\$ 1,650,000</i>
<i>Integrating ECE Competencies</i>	<i>\$ 387,756</i>		<i>\$ 387,756</i>		<i>\$ 387,757</i>		<i>\$ 1,163,269</i>
<i>Full QRIS Pilot</i>	<i>\$1,148,364</i>		<i>\$2,296,728</i>		<i><u>\$3,645,101</u></i>		<i><u>\$ 7,090,193</u></i>
Contracts	\$2,486,140		\$3,434,464		<u>\$4,582,858</u>		<u>\$ 10,503,462</u>
Construction	\$	None	\$	None	\$	None	\$
Other	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
Total Direct	\$2,582,140		\$3,530,464		<u>\$4,678,858</u>		<u>\$ 10,791,462</u>
Indirect	\$ 20,832		\$ 20,832		\$ 20,832		\$ 62,496
Grand Total	\$2,602,972		\$3,551,296		<u>\$4,699,690</u>		<u>\$ 10,853,958</u>

1. *Project Budget*

Category	Year 1 Amount	Comment	Year 2 Amount	Comment	Year 3 Amount	Comment	Total
Personnel	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Fringe	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Travel	\$ -	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
Equipment	\$ -	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
Supplies	\$ -	In kind	\$	In kind	\$	In kind	\$
<i>Comprehensive Plan</i>	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
<i>Data</i>	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
<i>Integrating ECE Competencies</i>	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
<i>Full QRIS Pilot</i>	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
Contracts	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
Construction	\$ -	None	\$ -	None	\$ -	None	\$ -
Other	\$ -	In kind	\$ -	In kind	\$ -	In kind	\$ -
Total Direct	\$ -		\$ -		\$ 200,000		\$ 200,000
Indirect	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -
Grand Total	\$ -		\$ -		\$4,499,680		\$ 10,653,948

Total Direct Costs: \$200,000

Indirect Costs: \$0

Total direct and indirect: \$200,000

2. *Matching Funds*

The table below provides the level of matching funds expected through state spending on its pilot projects identified as important to the Council's work. This projection assumes flat funding of the state's FY 2011 commitment. The state's total required match is \$466,667.

Matching Funds	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
State Preschool	\$		\$ 466,667	\$ 466,667
Total			\$ 466,667	\$ 466,667

One of the major goals of the California Early Learning Advisory Council (ELAC) is to increase the quality of care and educational opportunities for all children. We believe this will result in better outcomes for children and lead to improved academic results in future years. The ELAC will build on the work of the California Early Learning Quality Improvement System Advisory Committee by piloting the Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) in a portion of our state preschools.

California's state preschool program funds support quality early learning services to income eligible three-and four-year olds (as described in section II.A.1 of California's ELAC application). Total funding for state preschool is over \$438 million. The amount shown here as match represents the fact that a significant portion of the ELAC funding will be utilized in the piloting of the QRIS system as described in this application.